arXiv:1410.6225v1 [math.AP] 23 Oct 2014

Existence and multiplicity of solutions for nonlocal systems with Kirchhoff type

Zhitao Zhang*[a] and Yimin Sun†[b]

[a]Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science,Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

zzt@math.ac.cn

[b]Department of Mathematics, Northwest University, Xi'an 710127, China

ymsun@nwu.edu.cn

Abstract

Firstly, we use Nehari manifold and Mountain Pass Lemma to prove an existence result of positive solutions for a class of nonlocal elliptic system with Kirchhoff type. Then a multiplicity result is established by cohomological index of Fadell and Rabinowitz. We also consider the critical case and prove existence of positive least energy solution when the parameter β is sufficiently large.

Keywords: Critical point; Nehari manifold; cohomological index.

AMS Subjection Classification(2000): 35J55; 35J65; 49J40.

*Supported by NSFC 11325107,11271353, 11331010.

†Corresponding author.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we are concerned with existence and multiplicity results for the following nonlocal boundary value problem of Kirchhoff type

$$\begin{cases} -(a_1 + b_1 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_1 \ = \lambda_1 |u_1|^{p-1}u_1 + \beta |u_1|^{\frac{q-3}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}u_1 & in\ \Omega, \\ -(a_2 + b_2 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_2|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_2 \ = \lambda_2 |u_2|^{p-1}u_2 + \beta |u_1|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{q-3}{2}}u_2 & in\ \Omega, \\ u_1 = u_2 = 0 \quad on\ \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, for $N = 1, 2, 3$, is a bounded smooth domain, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and a_i, b_i, λ_i are positive constants respectively for $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, p and q are two positive numbers that satisfy some conditions to be stated later on.

Problem (1) is called nonlocal because of the presence of the terms $b_i \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x$, $i = 1, 2$. And the operator $b(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u$ appears in the Kirchhoff equation

$$\begin{cases} -(a + b \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u \ = f(x, u) & in\ \Omega \\ u = 0 \qquad on \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

related to the stationary analogue of the equation

$$u_{tt} - (a + b \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u = f(x, t),$$

which was proposed by Kirchhoff [15] as an extension of the classical D'Alembert's wave equation for free vibrations of elastic strings. Equation (2) has attracted a considerable attention only after Lions [18] presented an abstract framework to this problem. Some interesting and further results can be found in [2,19,20,22,23] and the references therein, among which Perera and Zhang obtained nontrivial solutions of a class of nonlocal quasi-linear elliptic boundary value problems using the Yang index, invariant sets of descent flow and critical groups in [22, 29].

Such nonlocal problems also model several physical and biological systems where u describes a process which depends on the average of itself, for example the population density (see, e.g. [1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 26]).

Without such nonlocal terms, (1) is related to the following nonlinear Schrödinger system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = \mu_1 u_1^3 + \beta u_1 u_2^2 & in\ \Omega, \\ -\Delta u_2 + \lambda_2 u_2 = \mu_2 u_2^3 + \beta u_2 u_1^2 & in\ \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

stemming from many physical problems, especially in nonlinear optics and in the Hartree-Fock theory for Bose-Einstein condensates; see, for example, [4, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 24, 27].

In the special case $f(x,u) = \lambda(u^+)^p$ with $3 < p < 2^* - 1$, problem (2) admits a positive solution $w(x) = w(x; a, b, \lambda)$ through the following minimization

$$\inf_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}} I(u)$$

where

$$I(u) = \frac{a}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + \frac{b}{4}\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{p+1}\int_\Omega (u^+)^{p+1}\,\mathrm{d}x$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\} : a\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + b\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x\right)^2 = \lambda\int_\Omega (u^+)^{p+1}\,\mathrm{d}x \right\}.$$

If we set $U_1(x) = w(x; a_1, b_1, \lambda_1)$ and $U_2(x) = w(x; a_2, b_2, \lambda_2)$, then problem (1) admits two semi-positive solutions $\mathbf{u}_1 = (U_1, 0)$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 = (0, U_2)$, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$.

We are interested in solutions $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$ of problem (1) with all components $u_j > 0$, $j = 1, 2$. These are called positive solutions as opposed to semi-positive solutions.

Firstly, we study problem (1) with the following subcritical growth:

$$p = q \in (3, 2^* - 1) \quad with \quad 2^* = \begin{cases} 6 & for\, N = 3, \\ \infty & for\, N = 1, 2. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

For $\beta > -\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}$, the Nehari manifold corresponding to the energy functional of problem (1) can be well defined (see the proof of *Lemma 2.1(i)*). We will show that the Morse index of semi-positive solution $\mathbf{u}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ is exactly one under above assumptions (see Lemma 2.3). This fact, jointly with the Mountain Pass Lemma, yields our first result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $p = q \in (3, 2^* - 1)$ and $\beta > -\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}$. Assume that $N = 1$ or Ω is radially symmetric. Problem (1) possesses a positive solution $\mathbf{u}^*$ with Morse index at least two.*

Remark 1.1. *The condition that $N = 1$ or Ω is radially symmetric is to ensure the uniqueness of positive solution for problem (2) with $f(x,u) = \lambda(u^+)^p$ (see [7]).*

For $\beta \le -\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}$, we can get infinitely many positive solutions of problem (1) under some symmetric conditions. In fact, since the oddness of nonlinearities and interaction

terms, problem (1) satisfies the hypotheses of the Fountain Theorem ([28]) which immediately yields a sequence of solutions. However, these solutions may be sign-changing. In order to obtain positive solutions, we consider the fully symmetric case

$$a := a_1 = a_2, \quad b := b_1 = b_2 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lambda := \lambda_1 = \lambda_2. \tag{5}$$

By (5) and $\beta \leq -\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}$, problem (1) has no positive solutions whose two components are the same. Furthermore, a free $\mathbb{Z}_2-$space can be defined by a Nehari manifold. Using cohomological index of Fadell and Rabinowitz [14] for the $\mathbb{Z}_2-$free actions, we obtain the following multiplicity result.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that condition (5) holds. Let $p = q \in (3, 2^* - 1)$ and $\beta \leq -\lambda$. Then problem (1) admits a sequence of positive solutions $\{\mathbf{u}_k\}$ with $\|\mathbf{u}_k\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \to \infty$.*

Next, we consider the following critical growth case:

$$p = 5 \quad \textit{and} \quad q \in (3, 5) \quad \textit{with} \quad N = 3. \tag{6}$$

Since the dimension is $N = 3$, $6 = \frac{2N}{N-2}$ is the critical Sobolev exponent. Hence there are critical nonlinearities and coupling interaction terms in this nonlocal system. To the authors' knowledge, however, there are few results on nonlocal systems with critical nonlinearities. In the case of a single nonlocal Kirchhoff-type equation with critical nonlinearity in $\mathbb{R}^3$

$$\begin{cases} -[M(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x)]\Delta u = \lambda f(x,u) + u^5 \quad \textit{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0 \quad \textit{in } \Omega, \qquad u = 0 \quad \textit{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

Alves-Correa-Figueiredo [2] obtained the existence of positive solutions for sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$ (f is subcritical growth). They used the concentration compactness principle to prove that the compactness is recovered when $\lambda > 0$ is sufficiently large. Inspired by this, we shall prove the following existence result for problem (1).

Theorem 1.3. *If condition (6) holds, then problem (1) has a positive least energy solution for sufficiently large $\beta > 0$.*

In fact, the conclusion of *Theorem 1.3* is also valid for subcritical growth case (i.e., condition (4)). This jointly with *Theorem 1.1* yields that

Corollary 1.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, problem (1) admits at least two positive solutions for sufficiently large $\beta > 0$, one of which has Morse index one and the other at least two.*

This paper is organized as follows:

- Section 2: proof of Theorem 1.1;
- Section 3: proof of Theorem 1.2;
- Section 4: proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.4.

Notation

- $H = H_0^1(\Omega)$ endowed with scalar product and norm
  $\langle u, v\rangle = \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, \mathrm{d}\, x, \qquad \|u\|^2 = \langle u, u\rangle;$
- $\mathcal{H} = H \times H$ whose elements will be denoted by $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$; its norm is
  $\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 = \|u_1\|^2 + \|u_2\|^2;$
- $\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega) = L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega)$ with its norm $|\mathbf{u}|_p^p = |u_1|_p^p + |u_2|_p^p$ for any $p \in (1, \infty)$;
- $$S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\substack{u \in H \setminus \{0\} \\ |u|_6 = 1}} \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \quad \mathrm{d}x.$$

2 The proof of Theorem 1.1

We assume that $p = q \in (3, 2^* - 1)$ and $\beta > -\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}$ in the whole section.

For $\mathbf{u} := (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{u}) &= \frac{1}{2}(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + \frac{1}{4}(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\, \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R})$ by Sobolev embedding theorem. We have that critical points of Φ are solutions of problem (1).

Next, we introduce the Nehari manifold

$$\mathcal{N} = \{\, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} : \quad F(\mathbf{u}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \Phi'(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}\rangle = 0\}.$$

Clearly, all nontrivial critical points of Φ are contained in $\mathcal{N}$.

Lemma 2.1. *(i) $\mathcal{N}$ is homeomorphic to the unit sphere of $\mathcal{H}$, and there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}\| \geq \rho, \ \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$.*

(ii) $\mathcal{N}$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ complete manifold of codimension one in $\mathcal{H}$.

(iii) If $\mathbf{u}$ is a critical point of the restriction $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$ of Φ to $\mathcal{N}$, then $\mathbf{u}$ is a nontrivial critical point of Φ.

(iv) $\Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)}(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + \frac{p-3}{4(p+1)}(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4)$, for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$.

(v) $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$ satisfies Palais-Smale condition.

Proof. (i) For any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} t\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N} \iff & a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2 + t^2(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ & = t^{p-1}\int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Notice that for any $\beta > -\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$

$$\int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\,\mathrm{d}x > 0.$$

We claim that for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{\mathbf{0}\}$ there exists a unique $t(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $t(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$.

Indeed, for fixed $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, (7) implies that $t\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$ if and only if t is a positive zero of the following function

$$f(t) = At^{p-1} - Bt^2 - C, \tag{8}$$

where A, B, C are positive constants (depending on $\mathbf{u}$). Notice that $f(0) < 0$, $f'(0) = 0$, $f''(0) < 0$, $f(+\infty) = +\infty$ and there exists a unique $t_1 > 0$ such that $f'(t_1) = 0$. Thus, there exists a unique positive number t^* such that $f(t^*) = 0$. Hence, there exists a unique $t(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $t(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$.

In order to prove the continuity of $t(\mathbf{u})$, we assume that $\mathbf{u}_n \to \mathbf{u}_0$ in $\mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. It follows from (7) that $\{t(\mathbf{u}_n)\}$ is bounded. Passing if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that $t(\mathbf{u}_n) \to t_0$, then $t_0 = t(\mathbf{u}_0)$ by (7) and the uniqueness of $t(\mathbf{u}_0)$. Hence $t(\mathbf{u}_n) \to t(\mathbf{u}_0)$. Moreover, the inverse map of $t(\mathbf{u})|_{S^\infty} : S^\infty \to \mathcal{N}$ can be defined by

$$\mathbf{u} \to \mathbf{u}/\|\mathbf{u}\|,$$

which is also continuous. Therefore, the Nehari manifold $\mathcal{N}$ is homeomorphic to the unit sphere of $\mathcal{H}$.

Moreover, if $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{N}$ then by Hölder inequality and Sobolev embedding theorem, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2 + b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4 \\ = & \int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\,\mathrm{d}x \\ \leq & c_1\|u_1\|^{p+1} + c_2\|u_2\|^{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from $p > 3$ that there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}\| \geq \rho$ for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$.

(ii) Notice that for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F^{'}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}\rangle = & 2(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + 4(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ & -(p+1)\int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\,\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N} \Leftrightarrow & a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2 + b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4 \\ & = \int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F^{'}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}\rangle = & (1-p)(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + (3-p)(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ < & -2\,\rho^2\,\min\{a_1, a_2\} \\ < & 0, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

This jointly with (i) and Implicit Function Theorem yields that $\mathcal{N}$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ complete manifold of codimension one in $\mathcal{H}$.

(iii) If $\mathbf{u}$ is a critical point of $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$, then there exists $\omega(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}) = \omega(\mathbf{u})F^{'}(\mathbf{u})$. It follows from the fact $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$ that

$$\omega(\mathbf{u})\langle F^{'}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}\rangle = \langle \Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}\rangle = F(\mathbf{u}) = 0.$$

Thus we deduced from (10) that $\omega(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ and $\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$.

(iv) This results from a simple calculation by (9).

(v) Assume that $\{\mathbf{u}_n\} \subset \mathcal{N}$ is a $(PS)_c$ sequence of $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$, that is,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) \to c \quad \textit{and} \quad \nabla_{\mathcal{N}}\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) \to \mathbf{0}.$$

Then there exist $\omega_n \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{N}}\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) = \Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n) - \omega_n F^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n). \tag{11}$$

By (iv) and $\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) \to c$ we have that $\|\mathbf{u}_n\| \leq C < +\infty$. Hence,

$$\omega_n \langle F^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n), \mathbf{u}_n\rangle = \langle \Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n), \mathbf{u}_n\rangle - \langle \nabla\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n), \mathbf{u}_n\rangle = o(1).$$

It follows from (10) that

$$\omega_n \to 0. \tag{12}$$

Notice that for all $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle F^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n), \mathbf{v}\rangle &= (2a_1 + 4b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1}\cdot\nabla v_1\,\mathrm{d}x + (2a_2 + 4b_2\|u_{n,2}\|^2)\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,2}\cdot\nabla v_2\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad -(p+1)\int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_{n,1}|^{p-1}u_{n,1}v_1 + \lambda_2|u_{n,2}|^{p-1}u_{n,2}v_2)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad -(p+1)\beta\int_\Omega (|u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}}|u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}u_{n,1}v_1 + |u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}}|u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}u_{n,2}v_2)\,\mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned}$$

By Hölder inequality and Sobolev embedding theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_\Omega |u_{n,1}|^{p-1}u_{n,1}v_1\,\mathrm{d}x\right| &\leq \int_\Omega |u_{n,1}|^p|v_1|\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq \left(\int_\Omega |u_{n,1}|^{p+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}}\left(\int_\Omega |v_1|^{p+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \\
&\leq C\|u_{n,1}\|^p\|v_1\| \\
&\leq C\|\mathbf{u}_n\|^p\|\mathbf{v}\|,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_\Omega |u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}}|u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}u_{n,1}v_1\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \\
\leq\ & \int_\Omega |u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p-1}{2}}|u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|v_1|\,\mathrm{d}x \\
\leq\ & \left(\int_\Omega |u_{n,1}|^{p+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{p-1}{2(p+1)}}\left(\int_\Omega |u_{n,2}|^{p+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_\Omega |v_1|^{p+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \\
=\ & |u_{n,1}|_{p+1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\,|u_{n,2}|_{p+1}^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\,|v_1|_{p+1} \\
\leq\ & C\|u_{n,1}\|^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\|u_{n,2}\|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\|v_1\| \\
=\ & C\|\mathbf{u}_n\|^p\|\mathbf{v}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we get estimates for

$$\left|\int_\Omega |u_{n,2}|^{p-1}u_{n,2}v_2\,\mathrm{d}x\right| \qquad \textit{and} \quad \left|\int_\Omega |u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}}|u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}u_{n,2}v_2\,\mathrm{d}x\right|.$$

It follows that

$$\|F^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n)\| \leq C(\|\mathbf{u}_n\| + \|\mathbf{u}_n\|^3 + \|\mathbf{u}_n\|^p),$$

and hence, $\|F^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n)\| \leq C < +\infty$ since $\mathbf{u}_n$ is bounded. This jointly with (11) and (12) yields that $\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n) \to \mathbf{0}$, that is, $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}$ is a $(PS)_c$ sequence of Φ.

Notice that $\mathbf{u}_n$ is bounded in $\mathcal{H}$. Passing if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that $\mathbf{u}_n \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathbf{u}_n \to \mathbf{u}$ in $\mathcal{L}^{p+1}(\Omega)$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
& (a_1 + b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1}\cdot\nabla(u_{n,1}-u_1)\mathrm{d}\,x + (a_2 + b_2\|u_{n,2}\|^2)\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,2}\cdot\nabla(u_{n,2}-u_2)\mathrm{d}\,x \\
= \;& \langle\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n), \mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}\rangle + \int_\Omega [\lambda_1|u_{n,1}|^{p-1}u_{n,1}(u_{n,1}-u_1) + \lambda_2|u_{n,2}|^{p-1}u_{n,2}(u_{n,2}-u_2)]\,\mathrm{d}\,x \\
& +\beta\int_\Omega [|u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}}|u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}u_{n,1}(u_{n,1}-u_1) + |u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}}u_{n,2}(u_{n,2}-u_2)]\,\mathrm{d}x \\
\to \;& 0. \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1}\cdot\nabla u_1 \quad \mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^2 \quad \mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq \liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{n,1}|^2 \quad \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{n,1}|^2 \quad \mathrm{d}x,
\end{aligned}$$

by Fatou's Lemma, that is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1}\cdot\nabla(u_{n,1}-u_1)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \geq 0.$$

Similarly, we also have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,2}\cdot\nabla(u_{n,2}-u_2)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \geq 0.$$

It follows from (13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(a_1 + b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1}\cdot\nabla(u_{n,1}-u_1)\,\mathrm{d}\,x &\to 0, \\
(a_2 + b_2\|u_{n,2}\|^2)\int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,2}\cdot\nabla(u_{n,2}-u_2)\,\mathrm{d}\,x &\to 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This jointly with the fact that $\|u_{n,i}\|$ is bounded, yields that $\|u_{n,i}\| \to \|u_i\|$, then $u_{n,i} \to u_i$ in H for $i = 1, 2$, that is, $\mathbf{u}_n \to \mathbf{u}$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, we have that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$ by $\mathbf{u}_n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\langle\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n), \mathbf{u}_n\rangle \to 0$. □

Remark 2.2. L*emma 2.1 implies that* $\inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{N}}\Phi(\mathbf{u})$ *can be achieved, giving rise to a nontrivial solution of problem (1). One may suspect that such a solution is a semi-positive one referred in the Introduction. However, the proof of* C*orollary 1.4 show that this can not occur when* $\beta > 0$ *is large enough.*

In order to demonstrate that there exists a nontrivial solution of problem (1) different from semi-positive ones $\mathbf{u}_1 = (U_1, 0)$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 = (0, U_2)$, we need the following lemma, which immediately yields that the Morse index of $\mathbf{u}_j$ is exactly one for $j = 1, 2$.

Lemma 2.3. $\mathbf{u}_j$, $j = 1, 2$, *are strict local minima of* Φ *on* $\mathcal{N}$.

Proof. For $j = 1, 2$, as referred in the Introduction, U_j achieves

$$\inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}_j} I_j(u)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_j(u) &= \frac{a_j}{2}\|u\|^2 + \frac{b_j}{4}\|u\|^4 - \frac{\lambda_j}{p+1}|u^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \qquad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{N}_j &= \{u \in H \setminus \{0\} : a_j\|u\|^2 + b_j\|u\|^4 = \lambda_j|u^+|_{p+1}^{p+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by $\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_j) = 0$ we get that

$$D^2_{\mathcal{N}_j} I_j(U_j)[h]^2 = I_j^{''}(U_j)[h]^2 \geq c_j\|h\|^2, \qquad \forall h \in T_{U_j}\mathcal{N}_j,$$

where $D^2_{\mathcal{N}_j} I_j(U_j)$ denotes the second derivative of Φ constrained on $\mathcal{N}$. For any $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, h_2) \in T_{\mathbf{u}_1}\mathcal{N}$, we have that $h_1 \in T_{U_1}\mathcal{N}_1$ by a simple calculation. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} D^2_{\mathcal{N}}\Phi(\mathbf{u}_1)[\mathbf{h}]^2 &= \Phi^{''}(\mathbf{u}_1)[\mathbf{h}]^2 \\ &= I^{''}(U_1)[h_1]^2 + a_2\|h_2\|^2 \\ &\geq c_1\|h_1\|^2 + a_2\|h_2\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that $\mathbf{u}_1$ is a strictly local minimum of Φ on $\mathcal{N}$. Similarly, we can prove that $\mathbf{u}_2$ is a strictly local minimum of Φ on $\mathcal{N}$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1

Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 imply that $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$ satisfies the hypotheses of the Mountain Pass Lemma ([5]). Hence the functional Φ has a mountain-pass point $\mathbf{u}^*$ on $\mathcal{N}$ such that $\Phi(\mathbf{u}^*) > max\{\Phi(\mathbf{u}_1), \Phi(\mathbf{u}_2)\}$.

We claim that the Morse index of $\mathbf{u}^*$ is at least two. Indeed, it follows from (10) that

$$\langle \Phi^{''}(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}\rangle < 0, \ \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N},$$

which implies that the Morse index of any critical point of Φ equals its Morse index as constrained critical point of $\Phi_{\mathcal{N}}$, increased by 1. Hence, the Morse index of $\mathbf{u}$ is at least two.

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, it is enough to ensure that $\mathbf{u}^* > 0$. We discuss it as follows.

If $\beta > 0$, we introduce the functional

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^+(\mathbf{u}) &= \frac{1}{2}(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + \frac{1}{4}(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{p+1}\int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1^+|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2^+|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1^+|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2^+|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\,\mathrm{d}x,\end{aligned}$$

where $u^+ = \max\{u, 0\}$ and the corresponding Nehari manifold

$$\mathcal{N}^+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\ \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} : \quad \langle \nabla\Phi^+(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}\rangle = 0\}.$$

Since $3 < p < 2^* - 1$, $\Phi^+ \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R})$. Hence we can repeat the arguments as above and get a mountain-pass critical point $\mathbf{u}^*$ of Φ^+ on $\mathcal{N}^+$, which gives rise to a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -(a_1 + b_1\int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^2\,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_1 = \lambda_1(u_1^+)^p + \beta(u_1^+)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}(u_2^+)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} & in\ \Omega \\ -(a_2 + b_2\int_\Omega |\nabla u_2|^2\,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_2 = \lambda_2(u_2^+)^p + \beta(u_1^+)^{\frac{p+1}{2}}(u_2^+)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} & in\ \Omega \\ u_1 = u_2 = 0 \quad on\ \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

It is clear to see that $\mathbf{u}^* \geq 0$. The fact that $\mathbf{u}^* \in \mathcal{N}^+$ implies $\mathbf{u}^* \neq \mathbf{0}$. By the uniqueness of problem (2) with $f(x,u) = \lambda(u^+)^p$ (see Remark 1.1), we get that $u_1^* \not\equiv 0$ and $u_2^* \not\equiv 0$. Applying the maximum principle to each equation in (14), we get that $u_1^* > 0$ and $u_2^* > 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1 when $\beta > 0$.

If $-\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2} < \beta \leq 0$, we consider the following functional

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{u}) &= \frac{1}{2}(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + \frac{1}{4}(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{p+1}\int_\Omega (\lambda_1|u_1^+|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2^+|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}})\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned}$$

and the Nehari manifold

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\ \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} : \quad \langle \nabla\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}\rangle = 0\}.$$

Similar arguments imply that $\tilde{\Phi}$ has a mountain-pass critical point $\mathbf{u}^*$ of $\tilde{\Phi}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$, which give rise to a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -(a_1 + b_1 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_1 \ - \beta |u_1|^{\frac{p-3}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} u_1 = \lambda_1 (u_1^+)^p & in\ \Omega, \\ -(a_2 + b_2 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_2|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_2 \ - \beta |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p-3}{2}} u_2 = \lambda_2 (u_2^+)^p & in\ \Omega, \\ u_1 = u_2 = 0 \quad on\ \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying these equations with u_1^- resp. u_2^- and integrating, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1 + b_1\|u_1\|^2) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1^-|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x - \beta \int_\Omega |u_1^-|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x &= 0, \qquad (15) \\ (a_2 + b_2\|u_2\|^2) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_2^-|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x - \beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2^-|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x &= 0. \qquad (16) \end{aligned}$$

Since $-\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2} < \beta \le 0$, we conclude that $u_1^* \ge 0$ and $u_2^* \ge 0$. By the uniqueness of problem (2) with $f(x,u) = \lambda(u^+)^p$ (see Remark 1.1), $u_1^* \not\equiv 0$ and $u_2^* \not\equiv 0$. Hence $u_1^* > 0$ and $u_2^* > 0$ in Ω by the strong maximum principle.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

3 The proof of Theorem 1.2

Assume that the hypotheses in Theorem 1.2 hold throughout the section, which lead us to consider the following nonlocal problem

$$\begin{cases} -(a + b \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_1 \ - \beta |u_1|^{\frac{p-3}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} u_1 = \lambda (u_1^+)^p & in\ \Omega, \\ -(a + b \int_\Omega |\nabla u_2|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_2 \ - \beta |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p-3}{2}} u_2 = \lambda (u_2^+)^p & in\ \Omega, \\ u_1 = u_2 = 0 \quad on\ \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \qquad (17)$$

where a, b, λ are positive constants, $\beta \le -\lambda$ and $p \in (3, 2^* - 1)$.

The energy functional associated with (17) (also denoted by Φ) is

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathbf{u}) \ = \ & \frac{a}{2}(\|u_1\|^2 + \|u_2\|^2) + \frac{b}{4}(\|u_1\|^4 + \|u_2\|^4) \\ & - \frac{1}{p+1} \int_\Omega \left(\lambda |u_1^+|^{p+1} + \lambda |u_2^+|^{p+1} + 2\beta |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \right) \mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned}$$

and clearly, $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R})$. Then, we put

$$\mathcal{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{H} \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} u_1 \not\equiv 0, \quad a\|u_1\|^2 + b\|u_1\|^4 - \beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x = \lambda |u_1^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \\ u_2 \not\equiv 0, \quad a\|u_2\|^2 + b\|u_2\|^4 - \beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x = \lambda |u_2^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \end{array} \right\},$$

which possesses the following properties:

Lemma 3.1. (*i*) *There exists* $\rho > 0$ *such that* $\|\mathbf{u}\| \geq \rho$ *for any* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$.

(*ii*) $\mathcal{M}$ *is a* $\mathcal{C}^2$ *complete manifold of codimension two in* $\mathcal{H}$.

(*iii*) *If* $\mathbf{u}$ *is a critical point of the restriction* $\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ *of* Φ *to* $\mathcal{M}$, *then* $\mathbf{u}$ *is a nontrivial critical point of* Φ.

(*iv*) $\Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{a(p-1)}{2(p+1)}(\|u_1\|^2 + \|u_2\|^2) + \frac{b(p-3)}{4(p+1)}(\|u_1\|^4 + \|u_2\|^4)$, *for* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$.

(*v*) $\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ *satisfies Palais-Smale condition.*

Proof. (i)By Sobolev embedding theorem, for all $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{M}$ we have that

$$a\|u_i\|^2 \leq \lambda |u_i^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \leq \lambda C \|u_i^+\|^{p+1}$$

for $i = 1, 2$, and hence,

$$\|\mathbf{u}\| \geq \max\{\|u_1\|, \|u_2\|\} \geq \rho := (\frac{a}{\lambda C})^{\frac{1}{p+1}},$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$.

(ii)We define $F : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$F(\mathbf{u}) = \begin{pmatrix} F_1(\mathbf{u}) \\ F_2(\mathbf{u}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a\|u_1\|^2 + b\|u_1\|^4 - \beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}x - \lambda |u_1^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \\ a\|u_2\|^2 + b\|u_2\|^4 - \beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}x - \lambda |u_2^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$, and

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \,|\, u_1, u_2 \not\equiv 0, F(\mathbf{u}) = 0\}.$$

We shall prove that for all $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{M}$, $F'(\mathbf{u})(u_1, 0)$ and $F'(\mathbf{u})(0, u_2)$ are linearly independent in $\mathbb{R}^2$. It is enough for us to prove that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{u_1} F_1(\mathbf{u}) u_1 & \partial_{u_2} F_1(\mathbf{u}) u_2 \\ \partial_{u_1} F_2(\mathbf{u}) u_1 & \partial_{u_2} F_2(\mathbf{u}) u_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is negative definite. In fact, for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{u_1} F_1(\mathbf{u}) u_1 &= 2a\|u_1\|^2 + 4b\|u_1\|^4 - \frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}x - (p+1)\lambda |u_1^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \\ &= (1-p)a\|u_1\|^2 + (3-p)b\|u_1\|^4 + \frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}x < 0, \\ \partial_{u_2} F_2(\mathbf{u}) u_2 &= (1-p)a\|u_2\|^2 + (3-p)b\|u_2\|^4 + \frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}x < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &-\partial_{u_1} F_1(\mathbf{u}) u_1 > -\frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}x = \partial_{u_2} F_1(\mathbf{u}) u_2, \\ &-\partial_{u_2} F_2(\mathbf{u}) u_2 > -\frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \, \mathrm{d}x = \partial_{u_1} F_2(\mathbf{u}) u_1, \\ &\textit{and} \quad \partial_{u_1} F_1(\mathbf{u}) u_1, \ \partial_{u_2} F_2(\mathbf{u}) u_2 < 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{u_1} F_1(\mathbf{u})u_1 & \partial_{u_2} F_1(\mathbf{u})u_2 \\ \partial_{u_1} F_2(\mathbf{u})u_1 & \partial_{u_2} F_2(\mathbf{u})u_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is negative definite. Consequently, $F^{'}(\mathbf{u})(u_1, 0)$ and $F^{'}(\mathbf{u})(0, u_2)$ are linearly independent in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and hence $F^{'}(\mathbf{u}) : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is surjective at every point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$. This jointly with Implicit Function Theorem implies that $\mathcal{M}$ is a $\mathcal{C}^2$ complete manifold of codimension two in $\mathcal{H}$.

(iii) If $\mathbf{u}$ is a critical point of $\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$, then there exist $\omega_1 = \omega_1(\mathbf{u})$ and $\omega_2 = \omega_2(\mathbf{u})$ in $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}) = \omega_1 F_1^{'}(\mathbf{u}) + \omega_2 F_2^{'}(\mathbf{u}). \tag{18}$$

Multiplying this with $(u_1, 0)$ and $(0, u_2)$, respectively, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{u_1} F_1(\mathbf{u})u_1 & \partial_{u_2} F_1(\mathbf{u})u_2 \\ \partial_{u_1} F_2(\mathbf{u})u_1 & \partial_{u_2} F_2(\mathbf{u})u_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows from the matrix is negative definite that $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0$, and therefore, $\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ by (18).

(iv) This results from a simple calculation by the definition of $\mathcal{M}$.

(v) Assume that $\{\mathbf{u}_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is a $(PS)_c$ sequence of $\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$, that is,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) \to c \quad and \quad \nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) \to \mathbf{0}.$$

Then there exist two sequences $\{\omega_{n,1}\}$ and $\{\omega_{n,2}\}$ in $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{M}} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) = \Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n) - \omega_{n,1} F_1^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n) - \omega_{n,2} F_2^{'}(\mathbf{u}). \tag{19}$$

By (iv) and $\Phi(\mathbf{u}_n) \to c$ we have that $\|\mathbf{u}_n\| \leq C < +\infty$. Going if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that $\mathbf{u}_n \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathbf{u}_n \to \mathbf{u}$ in $\mathcal{L}^{p+1}(\Omega)$.

Multiplying (19) with $(u_{n,1}, 0)$ and $(0, u_{n,2})$, we have

$$M_n \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{n,1} \\ \omega_{n,2} \end{pmatrix} = o(1). \tag{20}$$

where the matrix

$$M_n = \begin{pmatrix} M_n^{(1)} & M_n^{(2)} \\ M_n^{(2)} & M_n^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{u_1} F_1(\mathbf{u}_n)u_{n,1} & \partial_{u_2} F_1(\mathbf{u}_n)u_{n,2} \\ \partial_{u_1} F_2(\mathbf{u}_n)u_{n,1} & \partial_{u_2} F_2(\mathbf{u}_n)u_{n,2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We assume that $\|u_{n,1}\| \to T_1$ and $\|u_{n,2}\| \to T_2$ as $n \to +\infty$, and then T_1, $T_2 > 0$ by (i). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{(1)} &\to M^{(1)} := (1-p)aT_1^2 + (3-p)bT_2^4 + \frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x, \\ M_n^{(3)} &\to M^{(3)} := (1-p)aT_2^2 + (3-p)bT_2^4 + \frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x, \\ M_n^{(2)} &\to M^{(2)} := -\frac{p+1}{2}\beta \int_\Omega |u_1|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_2|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

If we denote

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M^{(1)} & M^{(2)} \\ M^{(2)} & M^{(3)} \end{pmatrix},$$

then M is negative definite and

$$(M + o(1)) \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{n,1} \\ \omega_{n,2} \end{pmatrix} = o(1)$$

by (20). We therefore conclude that $\omega_{n,1} \to 0$ and $\omega_{n,2} \to 0$. By similar arguments about the estimate of $\|F^{'}(\mathbf{u})\|$ in Lemma 2.1 (v), we can prove that

$$\|F_1^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n)\| \le C \qquad and \qquad \|F_2^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n)\| \le C.$$

It follows from (19) that $\Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n) \to 0$, that is, $\mathbf{u}_n$ is a $(PS)_c$ sequence of Φ. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & (a + b\|u_{n,1}\|^2) \int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1} \cdot \nabla (u_{n,1} - u_1) \mathrm{d}\, x + (a + b\|u_{n,2}\|^2) \int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,2} \cdot \nabla (u_{n,2} - u_2) \mathrm{d}\, x \\ = \;& \langle \Phi^{'}(\mathbf{u}_n), \mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u} \rangle + \int_\Omega [\lambda_1 |u_{n,1}^+|^{p-1} u_{n,1}(u_{n,1} - u_1) + \lambda_2 |u_{n,2}^+|^{p-1} u_{n,2}(u_{n,2} - u_2)] \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\ & + \beta \int_\Omega [|u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}} |u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} u_{n,1}(u_{n,1} - u_1) + |u_{n,1}|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} |u_{n,2}|^{\frac{p-3}{2}} u_{n,2}(u_{n,2} - u_2)] \,\mathrm{d}x \\ \to \;& 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1} \cdot \nabla (u_{n,1} - u_1) \,\mathrm{d}\, x \ge 0, \; \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,2} \cdot \nabla (u_{n,2} - u_2) \,\mathrm{d}\, x \ge 0,$$

by Fatou's Lemma. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1 + b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2) \int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,1} \cdot \nabla (u_{n,1} - u_1) \,\mathrm{d}\, x &\to 0, \\ (a_2 + b_2\|u_{n,2}\|^2) \int_\Omega \nabla u_{n,2} \cdot \nabla (u_{n,2} - u_2) \,\mathrm{d}\, x &\to 0. \end{aligned}$$

This jointly with the fact that $\|u_{n,i}\|$ is bounded, yields that $\|u_{n,i}\| \to \|u_i\|$, and hence, $u_{n,i} \to u_i$ in H for $i = 1, 2$, that is, $\mathbf{u}_n \to \mathbf{u}$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, we have that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$ by $\mathbf{u}_n \in \mathcal{M}$. □

One can write the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$ multiplicatively as $\{1, \sigma\}$, where $\sigma : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is defined by $\sigma(u_1, u_2) = (u_2, u_1)$. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}_2-$space $(\sigma(\mathbf{u}) \neq \mathbf{u}, \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}))$ since $\beta \leq -\lambda$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the class of $\sigma-$invariant closed subsets of $\mathcal{M}$. The cohomological index $i : \mathcal{F} \to \mathrm{N} \cup \{0, \infty\}$ due to Fadell and Rabinowitz [14] is well defined and satisfies the following properties.

Lemma 3.2. *([14])* $\quad \forall\ A, B \in \mathcal{F}$,

(i_1)*(Definiteness)* $i(A) = 0$ *if and only if* $A = \emptyset$;

(i_2)*(Monotonicity) If* $f : A \to B$ *is an* $\sigma-$*equivariant map (in particular, if* $A \subset B$*), then* $i(A) \leq i(B)$;

(i_3)*(Continuity) If* A *is compact then* $i(A) < \infty$ *and there exists a relatively open* $\sigma-$*invariant neighborhood* N *of* A *in* $\mathcal{M}$ *such that* $i(A) = i(N)$;

(i_4)*(Subadditivity) If* $X \in \mathcal{F}$ *and* $X = A \cup B$*, then* $i(X) \leq i(A) + i(B)$;

(i_5)*(Neighborhood of zero) If* U *is a bounded closed* $\sigma-$*invariant neighborhood of the origin in a normed linear space* W*, then* $i(\partial U)$ *equals to the dimension of* W.

Denote $K_c = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M} : \Phi(\mathbf{u}) = c, \Phi'(\mathbf{u}) = 0\}$. For $k \in \mathrm{N}$, let $\mathcal{F}_k = \{M \in \mathcal{F} : i(M) \geq k\}$ and

$$c_k = \inf_{M \in \mathcal{F}_k} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in M} \Phi(\mathbf{u}).$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_{k+1} \subset \mathcal{F}_k$, $c_k \leq c_{k+1}$.

We claim that c_k is finite. In fact, for fixed k, there exist $2k$ points $\{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_{2k}\} \subset \mathring{\Omega}$, and $\rho_k > 0$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{2k} B_{\rho_k}(x_i) \subset \Omega$ and $B_{\rho_k}(x_i) \bigcap B_{\rho_k}(x_j) = \emptyset$, for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2k$. Define cut-off functions by $\phi_i(x) := \phi(\frac{x - x_i}{\rho_k})$, $i = 1, \cdots, 2k$, where $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\Omega, [0, 1])$ satisfying $\phi \equiv 1$ on $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)$, $\phi \equiv 0$ on $\Omega \setminus B_1(0)$ and $|\nabla \phi|_\infty \leq 2$. Then $\mathbf{v}_i := (\phi_i, \phi_{k+i}) \in \mathcal{H}$, $i = 1, \cdots, k$, and hence, $W :=$span$\{\mathbf{v}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{v}_k\}$ is a k dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. We can deduce from arguments below (8) that there exists a unique $t(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $t(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}$. It follows from (i_5) of Lemma 3.2 that the intersection of $\mathcal{M}$ with W is a compact set in $\mathcal{F}_k$. Hence, $c_k \leq max\{\Phi(\mathbf{v}) \,|\, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{M} \bigcap W\} < +\infty$.

Notice that Φ is $\sigma-$invariant and Φ_M satisfies (PS) condition. We have

Proposition 3.1. *(1) If $-\infty < c_k = \cdots = c_{k+m-1} = c < \infty$, then $i(K_c) \geq m$. In particular, if $-\infty < c_k < \infty$ then $K_{c_k} \neq \emptyset$.*

(2) If $-\infty < c_k < \infty$ for all sufficiently large k, then $c_k \to \infty$ as $k \to +\infty$.

This proposition is a slight variant of Proposition 3.14.7 in [21]. We sketch its proof for completeness. Firstly, two lemmas are in order.

Since Φ and $\mathcal{M}$ are $\sigma-$invariant, by Lemma 3.1 of [28] we have

Lemma 3.3. *(Equivariant Deformation Lemma)*

If $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$, then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a map $\eta \in \mathcal{C}([0,1] \times \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$ satisfying

(i) $\eta(0, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$;

(ii) $\eta(1, \Phi^{c+\varepsilon} \setminus N_\delta(K_c)) \subset \Phi^{c-\varepsilon}$;

(iii) $\Phi(\eta(\cdot, \mathbf{u}))$ *is non-increasing for all* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$;

(iv) $\sigma(\eta(s, \mathbf{u})) = \eta(s, \sigma(\mathbf{u})), \quad \forall s \in [0,1]$ *and* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$. If there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $c - \varepsilon < c_k \leq \cdots \leq c_{k+m-1} < c + \varepsilon$, then $i(K_c) \geq m$.*

Proof. Since $\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfies (PS) condition, K_c is compact. Then $i(N_\delta(K_c)) = i(K_c)$ for some $\delta > 0$ by Lemma 3.2 (i_3). Lemma 3.3 implies that there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a $\sigma-$equivariant map $\eta \in \mathcal{C}([0,1] \times \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$ such that $\eta(\Phi^{c+\varepsilon} \setminus N_\delta(K_c)) \subset \Phi^{c-\varepsilon}$. It follows that

$$i(\Phi^{c+\varepsilon}) \leq i(\overline{\Phi^{c+\varepsilon} \setminus N_\delta(K_c)}) + i(N_\delta(K_c)) \leq i(\Phi^{c-\varepsilon}) + i(K_c) \tag{21}$$

by Lemma 3.2 (i_2) and (i_4). The fact that $c - \varepsilon < c_k$ jointly the definition of c_k yields that $i(\Phi^{c-\varepsilon}) \leq k - 1$. Similarly, we have that $i(\Phi^{c+\varepsilon}) \geq k + m - 1$. So $i(K_c) \geq m$ follows from (21). □

Proof of Proposition 3.1

(1) Lemma 3.4 immediately yields that $i(K_c) \geq m$. If one take $m = 1$ then $i(K_{c_k}) \geq 1$. So $K_{c_k} \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.2 (i_1).

(2) Suppose by contradiction that $c_k \to c < \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ as in Lemma 3.4 and k so large that $c_k > c - \varepsilon$, one has that $i(K_c) = \infty$ since $c_{k+m-1} \leq c$ for all m, contradicting with the compactness of K_c and Lemma 3.2 (i_4). □

Now we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proposition 3.1 implies that one can take $\mathbf{u}_k \in K_{c_k}$ for every k satisfying $\Phi(\mathbf{u}_k) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. By Lemma 3.1(iv), we get that $\|\mathbf{u}_k\| \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.

Since $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$a\|\mathbf{u}_k\|^2 \leq \lambda|\mathbf{u}_k^+|_{p+1}^{p+1} \leq \lambda|\Omega|^{p+1}\|\mathbf{u}_k\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Omega)}^{p+1}.$$

Therefore, $\|\mathbf{u}_k\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \to \infty$, as $k \to \infty$. Next, we shall prove $\mathbf{u}_k > 0$. It follows from (15) and (16) that $\mathbf{u}_k \geq 0$. Since $\mathbf{u}_k = (u_{k,1}, u_{k,2}) \in \mathcal{M}$, $u_{k,1} \not\equiv 0$ and $u_{k,2} \not\equiv 0$. Thus, the strong maximum principle implies that $u_{k,1} > 0$ and $u_{k,2} > 0$ in Ω. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

Remark 3.5. *For problem (3), Dancer-Wei-Weth established similar results in [12]. However, their proof relies on a variant of Liusternik-Schnirelman theory on a sub-manifold.*

4 Proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.4

In this section, we deal with the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -(a_1 + b_1\int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^2\,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_1 \;= \lambda_1 u_1^5 + \beta|u_1|^{\frac{q-3}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}u_1 & in\ \Omega, \\ -(a_2 + b_2\int_\Omega |\nabla u_2|^2\,\mathrm{d}x)\Delta u_2 \;= \lambda_2 u_2^5 + \beta|u_1|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}|u_2|^{\frac{q-3}{2}}u_2 & in\ \Omega, \\ u_1, u_2 > 0 \quad in\ \Omega, \qquad u_1 = u_2 = 0 \quad on\ \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a smooth bounded domain, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $q \in (3, 5)$.

The solutions of problem (22) are critical points of the following functional on $\mathcal{H}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\mathbf{u}) \;=\; & \frac{1}{2}(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + \frac{1}{4}(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ & -\frac{1}{6}\int_\Omega \left(\lambda_1|u_1^+|^6 + \lambda_2|u_2^+|^6\right)\,\mathrm{d}x - \frac{2\beta}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u_1^+|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}|u_2^+|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

We firstly prove that this functional has the Mountain Pass Geometry.

Lemma 4.1. *For $\beta > 0$, there exist δ,$\alpha > 0$ and $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying that*

(i) for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \delta$, $\Psi(\mathbf{u}) \geq \alpha > 0$;

(ii) $\|\mathbf{e}\| > \delta$ and $\Psi(\mathbf{e}) < 0$.

Proof. By Sobolev embedding theorem, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|u^+|_6^6 \le C\|u\|^6, \quad |u^+|_{q+1}^{q+1} \le C\|u\|^{q+1}, \quad \forall u \in H.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\mathbf{u}) \;\ge\; & \frac{1}{2}(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + \frac{1}{4}(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4) \\ & -\frac{(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)C}{6}(\|u_1\|^6 + \|u_2\|^6) - \frac{\beta C}{q+1}(\|u_1\|^{q+1} + \|u_2\|^{q+1}).\end{aligned}$$

It follows from $q \in (3,5)$ that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\alpha := \inf_{\|\mathbf{u}\|=\delta} \Psi(\mathbf{u}) > 0.$$

Let $\phi \in H$ with $\phi > 0$ in Ω. We have, for $t \ge 0$

$$\Psi(t\phi, t\phi) = \frac{a_1+a_2}{2}\|\phi\|^2 t^2 + \frac{b_1+b_2}{4}\|\phi\|^4 t^4 - \frac{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}{6}|\phi|_6^6 t^6 - \frac{2\beta}{q+1}|\phi|_{q+1}^{q+1} t^{q+1}.$$

Since $3 < q < 5$, there exists $\mathbf{e} := (t_\beta\phi, t_\beta\phi)$ satisfying that $\Psi(\mathbf{e}) < 0$ and $\|\mathbf{e}\| > \delta$ for some t_β is large enough. □

We put

$$c_*(\beta) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_\beta} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \Psi(\gamma(t))$$

where

$$\Gamma_\beta := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}([0,1], \mathcal{H}) | \quad \gamma(0) = 0, \quad \gamma(1) = \mathbf{e}\}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3,$c_*(\beta) \to 0$ as $\beta \to \infty$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, there exists $t_\beta > 0$ such that $\Psi(t_\beta\phi, t_\beta\phi) = \max_{t\ge0} \Psi(t\phi, t\phi)$. Hence

$$(a_1+a_2)\|\phi\|^2 t_\beta + (b_1+b_2)\|\phi\|^4 t_\beta^3 = (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)|\phi|_6^6 t_\beta^5 + 2\beta|\phi|_{q+1}^{q+1} t_\beta^q, \tag{23}$$

which implies that t_β and βt_β are uniformly bounded w.r.t. β.

Going if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that $t_\beta \to 0$ as $\beta \to \infty$. Define $\gamma_\beta(t) := t\mathbf{e}(\beta)$ for any $t \in [0,1]$, then $\gamma_\beta \in \Gamma_\beta$.

This jointly with (23) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}0 \le c_*(\beta) \;\le\; & \max_{t\ge0} \Psi(\gamma_\beta(t)) = \Psi(t_\beta\phi, t_\beta\phi) \\ \le\; & \frac{a_1+a_2}{3}\|\phi\|^2 t_\beta^2 + \frac{b_1+b_2}{12}\|\phi\|^4 t_\beta^4.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $c_*(\beta) \to 0$ as $\beta \to \infty$. □

By the Mountain Pass Lemma without (PS) condition (see [5] or [28]), there exists a sequence $\{\mathbf{u}_n := (u_{n,1}, u_{n,2})\} \subset \mathcal{H}$ such that $\Psi(\mathbf{u}_n) \to c_*$ and $\Psi'(\mathbf{u}_n) \to 0$. We assume that $(u_{n,1}, u_{n,2})$ is nonnegative, otherwise we consider $(|u_{n,1}|, |u_{n,2}|)$.

For n large enough, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} c_*(\beta) + \|u_{n,1}\| + \|u_{n,2}\| &\geq \Psi(u_{n,1}, u_{n,2}) - \frac{1}{q+1}\langle \Psi'(u_{n,1}, u_{n,2}), (u_{n,1}, u_{n,2})\rangle \\ &= \frac{q-1}{2(q+1)}(a_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2 + a_2\|u_{n,2}\|^2) + \frac{q-3}{4(q+1)}(b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^4 + b_2\|u_{n,2}\|^4) \\ &\quad -\frac{5-q}{6(q+1)}(\lambda_1|u_{n,1}^+|^6 + \lambda_2|u_{n,2}^+|^6) \\ &\geq C(\|u_{n,1}\|^2 + \|u_{n,2}\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|u_{n,1}\|$ and $\|u_{n,2}\|$ are bounded. Going if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that $u_{n,1} \rightharpoonup \bar{u}_1$ and $u_{n,2} \rightharpoonup \bar{u}_2$.

Lemma 4.3. *For $\beta > 0$ large enough, $u_{n,1} \to \bar{u}_1$ and $u_{n,2} \to \bar{u}_2$ in H as $n \to \infty$; Moreover, $(\bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2) \not\equiv (0,0)$.*

Proof. The main idea of this proof is motivated by Alves-Correa-Figueiredo [2] in the case of a single equation. Suppose that $|\nabla u_{n,1}|^2 \rightharpoonup |\nabla \bar{u}_1|^2 + \mu$ and $|u_{n,1}^6| \rightharpoonup |\bar{u}_1|^6 + \nu$. The concentration compactness principle due to Lions yields that there exist an at most countable index set Λ, sequences $\{\mathbf{x}_i\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $\{\mu_i\}$,$\{\nu_i\} \subset [0, \infty)$, such that for any $i \in \Lambda$,

$$\nu = \sum_{i\in\Lambda} \nu_i \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \quad \mu \geq \sum_{i\in\Lambda} \mu_i \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i} \qquad S\nu_i^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mu_i. \tag{24}$$

Define a cut-off function by $\varphi_\rho(x) := \varphi(\frac{\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_i}{\rho})$ for every $\rho > 0$ where $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\Omega, [0,1])$ satisfying $\varphi \equiv 1$ on $B_1(0)$, $\varphi \equiv 0$ on $\Omega \setminus B_2(0)$ and $|\nabla\varphi|_\infty \leq 2$.

Hence,

$$\langle \Psi'(u_{n,1}, u_{n,2}), (\varphi_\rho u_{n,1}, 0)\rangle \to 0,$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} &(a_1 + b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)\int_\Omega u_{n,1}\nabla u_{n,1}\nabla\varphi_\rho \,\mathrm{d}x + (a_1 + b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)\int_\Omega \varphi_\rho|\nabla u_{n,1}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\ = \;& \lambda_1\int_\Omega \varphi_\rho|u_{n,1}|^6 \,\mathrm{d}x + \beta\int_\Omega \varphi_\rho|u_{n,1}|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}|u_{n,2}|^{\frac{q+1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}x + o(1) \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

By direct calculations and Hölder inequality, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\rho\to 0}\big[\lim_{n\to\infty}(a_1+b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)\int_\Omega u_{n,1}\nabla u_{n,1}\nabla\varphi_\rho\,\mathrm{d}x\big]\\
\le\ &\lim_{\rho\to 0}\big[\lim_{n\to\infty}(a_1+b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)|u_{n,1}|_3\|u_{n,1}\|(\int_\Omega|\nabla\varphi_\rho|^6\,\mathrm{d}x)^{\frac{1}{6}}\big]\\
\le\ &C\lim_{\rho\to 0}\rho^2=0,\\
&\lim_{\rho\to 0}\big[\lim_{n\to\infty}(a_1+b_1\|u_{n,1}\|^2)\int_\Omega\varphi_\rho|\nabla u_{n,1}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\big]\\
\ge\ &\lim_{\rho\to 0}a_1\int_\Omega\varphi_\rho(|\nabla\bar{u}_1|^2+\mu)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
=\ &\lim_{\rho\to 0}a_1\int_\Omega\varphi_\rho\mu\,\mathrm{d}x\\
\ge\ &a_1\mu_i,\\
&\lim_{\rho\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_1\int_\Omega\varphi_\rho|u_{n,1}|^6\,\mathrm{d}x\\
=\ &\lim_{\rho\to 0}\lambda_1\int_\Omega\varphi_\rho(|\bar{u}_1|^6+\nu)\,\mathrm{d}x\\
=\ &\lambda_1\nu_i,\\
&\lim_{\rho\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\beta\int_\Omega\varphi_\rho|u_{n,1}|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}|u_{n,2}|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x\\
\le\ &\lim_{\rho\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\beta\left(\int_\Omega\varphi_\rho^{\frac{12}{5-q}}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{5-q}{12}}\left(\int_\Omega|u_{n,1}|^6\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{q+1}{12}}\left(\int_\Omega|u_{n,2}|^{q+1}\,\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
\le\ &C\lim_{\rho\to 0}\rho^3=0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, letting $n\to\infty$ and $\rho\to 0$ in (25), we get that $\lambda_1\nu_i\ge a_1\mu_i$. This jointly (24), yields that $\nu_i\ge(a_1S/\lambda_1)^{\frac{3}{2}}$.

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_*(\beta) &= \Psi(u_{n,1},u_{n,2})-\frac{1}{q+1}\langle\Psi'(u_{n,1},u_{n,2}),(u_{n,1},u_{n,2})\rangle+o(1)\\
&\ge \frac{5-q}{6(q+1)}\int_\Omega\lambda_1|u_{n,1}|^6\,\mathrm{d}x+o(1)\\
&\ge \frac{5-q}{6(q+1)}\int_\Omega\lambda_1\varphi_\rho|u_{n,1}|^6\,\mathrm{d}x+o(1),
\end{aligned}
$$

letting $n\to\infty$, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_*(\beta) &\ge \frac{5-q}{6(q+1)}\lambda_1\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\varphi_\rho(\mathbf{x}_i)\nu_i\\
&= \frac{5-q}{6(q+1)}\lambda_1\sum_{i\in\Lambda}\nu_i\\
&\ge \frac{5-q}{6(q+1)}\lambda_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}(a_1S)^{\frac{3}{2}}>0.
\end{aligned}
$$

This contradicts with Lemma 4.2 when β is large enough. Hence, Λ is empty and it follows that $u_{n,1} \to \bar{u}_1$ in $L^6(\Omega)$. In the same way, we get that $u_{n,2} \to \bar{u}_2$ in $L^6(\Omega)$. By similar arguments as in Lemma 2.1(v), we can prove that $u_{n,1} \to \bar{u}_1$ and $u_{n,2} \to \bar{u}_2$ in H.

Moreover, we have that for fixed $\beta > 0$,

$$\Psi(\bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2) = c_*(\beta) \geq \alpha > 0,$$

with α obtained in *Lemma 4.1 (i)*. Hence, $(\bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2) \not\equiv (0, 0)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3

Lemma 4.3 immediately yields that $(\bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2)$ is a nonnegative solution of problem (22) as β is large enough.

In order to prove Theorem 1.3, it is enough for us to prove $\bar{u}_1 > 0$ and $\bar{u}_2 > 0$.

In fact, if $\bar{u}_2 \equiv 0$, then $\bar{u}_1 \geq 0$ and $\bar{u}_1 \not\equiv 0$ which is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -(a_1 + b_1\|u\|^2)\Delta u = \lambda_1 (u^+)^5 & in \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 \quad on \quad \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

Then, maximum principle implies that $\bar{u}_1 > 0$. Moreover, $\bar{u}_1$ is a critical point of

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2} a_1 \|u\|^2 + \frac{1}{4}\|u\|^4 + \lambda_1 |u^+|_6^6, \qquad \forall u \in H.$$

We can define the Nehari manifolds corresponding to Ψ and J respectively by

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2 + b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4 \\ = \int_\Omega (\lambda_1 |u_1^+|^6 + \lambda_2 |u_2^+|^6 + 2\beta |u_1^+|^{\frac{q+1}{2}} |u_2^+|^{\frac{q+1}{2}}) \, \mathrm{d}x \end{array} \right\},$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \{u \in H \setminus \{0\} | a_1\|u\|^2 + b_1\|u\|^4 = \lambda_1 |u^+|_6^6\}.$$

We claim that $\mathcal{N}$ is homeomorphic to the unit sphere of $\mathcal{H}$. Indeed, for fixed $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $t\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$ if and only if t is a positive zero of the following function on $\mathbb{R}$

$$g(t) := At^4 + Bt^{q-1} - Ct^2 - D,$$

where A, B, C and D are positive constants (depending on $\mathbf{u}$). In order to examine the zeros of g, we firstly consider its derivative $g'(t) = t[4At^2 + (q-1)Bt^{q-3} - 2C]$, and define $h(t) = 4At^2 + (q-1)Bt^{q-3} - 2C$. Observing that $h(0) < 0$, $h(+\infty) = +\infty$ and $h'(t) > 0$

$\forall\ t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we can conclude that there exists a unique $\bar{t} > 0$ such that $h^{'}(\bar{t}) = 0$. In other words, there exists a unique $\bar{t} > 0$ such that $g^{'}(\bar{t}) = 0$. Notice that $g(0) < 0$, $g^{'}(0) = 0$, $g^{''}(0) < 0$ and $g(+\infty) = +\infty$. Thus, $g(t)$ has a unique positive zero, and hence, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, there exists a unique $t(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $t(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}$. By similar arguments as in the proof of *Lemma* 2.1 (i), we have that $\mathcal{N}$ is homeomorphic to the unit sphere of $\mathcal{H}$.

It follows from similar arguments as in *Theorem* 4.2 [28] that

$$c_*(\beta) = \inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{N}} \Psi(\mathbf{u}).$$

Furthermore,

$$J(\bar{u}_1) = \Psi(\bar{u}_1, 0) = \inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{N}} \Psi(\mathbf{u}) = \inf_{\mathbf{u}\in\tilde{\mathcal{N}}\times\{0\}} \Psi(\mathbf{u}) = \inf_{u\in\tilde{\mathcal{N}}} J(u).$$

Thus, $\bar{u}_1$ is a least energy solution of problem (26).

It follows that

$$\inf_{\substack{u\in H\setminus\{0\}\\ |u|_6=1}} a_1\|u\|^2 + b_1\|u\|^4$$

can be attained on $\Omega \neq \mathbb{R}^3$, which contradicts with the fact that

S is never attained on domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$,$\Omega \neq \mathbb{R}^3$(Theorem III.1.2, [25]).

Hence, $\bar{u}_2 \not\equiv 0$. Similar arguments implies that $\bar{u}_1 \not\equiv 0$. The strong maximum principle can be applied to each equation of problem (22) and implies that $\bar{u}_1 > 0$ and $\bar{u}_2 > 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4

Let us recall that for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^+(\mathbf{u}) &= \frac{1}{2}(a_1\|u_1\|^2 + a_2\|u_2\|^2) + \frac{1}{4}(b_1\|u_1\|^4 + b_2\|u_2\|^4)\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{p+1}\int_\Omega \left(\lambda_1|u_1^+|^{p+1} + \lambda_2|u_2^+|^{p+1} + 2\beta|u_1^+|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}|u_2^+|^{\frac{p+1}{2}}\right) \mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

We define

$$c_*^+(\beta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_\beta^+} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \Phi^+(\gamma(t)),$$

where

$$\Gamma_\beta^+ := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}([0,1], \mathcal{H}) | \quad \gamma(0) = 0, \quad \Phi^+(\gamma(1)) < 0\}.$$

It follows from condition (4) that Φ^+ satisfies the (PS) condition.

Using similar arguments as in *Lemma 4.1* and *Lemma 4.2*, we have:

1. there exist positive numbers δ and α (depending on β) such that for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \delta$, $\Phi^+(\mathbf{u}) \geq \alpha > 0$.

2. for $\beta > 0$, there exists $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}(\beta) \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\Phi^+(\mathbf{e}) < 0$ and $\|\mathbf{e}\| \geq \delta$.

3. under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, $c_*^+(\beta) \to 0$ as $\beta \to \infty$.

By the Mountain Pass Lemma with (PS) condition (see [5] or [28]), we obtain a critical point $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$ of Φ^+ satisfying that

$$\Phi^+(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = c_*^+(\beta), \qquad \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq 0 \qquad and \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \not\equiv \mathbf{0}.$$

If $\tilde{u}_2 \equiv 0$, then $\tilde{u}_1$ is a positive solution of problem (2) with $a = a_1$, $b = b_1$ and $f(x,u) = \lambda_1(u^+)^p$. The condition that $N = 1$ or Ω is a radially symmetric ensures that such a problem has a uniqueness positive solution (see *Remark 1.1*). Hence $\tilde{u}_1 = U_1$. It follows that

$$\frac{p-1}{2(p+1)} a_1 \|U_1\|^2 + \frac{p-3}{4(p+1)} b_1 \|U_1\|^4 = \Phi^+(U_1, 0) = c_*^+(\beta) \to 0, \qquad as \quad \beta \to +\infty,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, we have proved that $\tilde{u}_2 \not\equiv 0$. Similar arguments implies $\tilde{u}_1 \not\equiv 0$. The strong maximum principle can be applied to each equation of problem (1) and yields that $\tilde{u}_1 > 0$ and $\tilde{u}_2 > 0$.

Now, we have obtained a positive least energy solution $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ of problem (1) when $\beta > 0$ is sufficiently large. Moreover,

$$\Phi^+(\mathbf{u}^*) \geq max\{\Phi^+(\mathbf{u}_1), \Phi^+(\mathbf{u}_2)\} > \Phi^+(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = c_*^+(\beta) \to 0, as\, \beta \to +\infty,$$

where $\mathbf{u}^*$ is the solution obtained in Theorem 1.1. Thus, we get two positive solutions of problem (1) for sufficiently large $\beta > 0$. □

References

1. Alves, C. O., Correa, F. J. S. A. On existence of solutions for a class of problem involving a nonlinear operator. *Comm. Appl. Nonlinear Anal.*, 8(2):43–56 (2001)

2. Alves, C. O., Corrêa, F. J. S. A. and Figueiredo, G. M. On a class of nonlocal elliptic problems with critical growth. *Differ. Equ. Appl.*, 2(3):409–417 (2010)

3. Alves, C. O., Corrêa, F. J. S. A. and Ma, T. F. Positive solutions for a quasilinear elliptic equation of Kirchhoff type. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 49(1):85–93 (2005)

4. Ambrosetti, A., Colorado, E. Standing waves of some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 75(2):67–82 (2007)

5. Ambrosetti, A., Rabinowitz, P. H. Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 14:349–381 (1973)

6. Andrade, D., Ma, T. F. An operator equation suggested by a class of nonlinear stationary problems. *Comm. Appl. Nonlinear Anal.*, 4(4):65–71 (1997)

7. Anello, G. A uniqueness result for a nonlocal equation of kirchhoff type and some related open problem. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 373(1):248–251 (2011)

8. Bartsch, T., Wang,Z.-Q. and Wei, J. Bound states for a coupled Schördinger system. *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 2(2):353–367 (2007)

9. Chipot, M., Lovat, B. Some remarks on nonlocal elliptic and parabolic problems. In: Proceedings of the Second World Congress of Nonlinear Analysts, Part 7 (Athens, 1996), Vol. 30, 1997, 4619–4627

10. Chipot, M., Rodrigues, J.-F. On a class of nonlocal nonlinear elliptic problems. *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.*, 26(3):447–467 (1992)

11. Dancer, E. N., Wei, J. Spike solutions in coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations with attractive interaction. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(3):1189–1208 (2009)

12. Dancer, E. N., Wei, J. and Weth, T. A priori bounds versus multiple existence of positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger system. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 27(3):953–969 (2010)

13. Figueiredo, D.G. de, Lopes, O. Solitary waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger systems. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 25(1):149–161 (2008)

14. Fadell, E. R., Rabinowitz, P. H. Generalized cohomological index theories for Lie group actions with an application to bifurcation questions for Hamiltonian systems. *Invent. Math.*, 45(2):139–174 (1978)

15. G. Kirchhoff. *Mechanik*. Teubner, Leipzig, 1883

16. Lin, T.-C., Wei, J. Ground state of N coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbf{R}^n$, $n \leq 3$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 255(3):629–653 (2005)

17. Lin, T.-C., Wei, J. Spikes in two-component systems of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with trapping potentials. *J. Differ. Equ.*, 229(2):538–569 (2006)

18. Lions, J.-L. On some questions in boundary value problems of mathematical physics. In: Contemporary developments in continuum mechanics and partial differential equations, Vol. 30 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978, 284–346

19. Ma, T. F., Muñoz Rivera, J. E. Positive solutions for a nonlinear nonlocal elliptic transmission problem. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 16(2):243–248 (2003)

20. Mao, A.M., Zhang, Z.T. Sign-changing and multiple solutions of Kirchhoff type problems without the P.S. condition. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 70(3):1275–1287 (2009)

21. Perera, K., Agarwal, R. P. and O'Regan, D. *Morse theoretic aspects of p-Laplacian type operators*, Vol. 161 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.

22. Perera, K., Zhang, Z.T. Nontrivial solutions of Kirchhoff-type problems via the Yang index. *J. Differential Equations*, 221(1):246–255 (2006)

23. Ricceri, B. On an elliptic Kirchhoff-type problem depending on two parameters. *J. Global Optim.*, 46(4):543–549 (2010)

24. Sirakov, B. Least energy solitary waves for a system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbf{R}^n$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 271(1):199–221 (2007)

25. Struwe, M. Variational methods, Vol. 34 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics*, 3rd ed. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000

26. Vasconcellos, C. F. On a nonlinear stationary problem in unbounded domains. *Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid*, 5(2-3):309–318 (1992)

27. Wei, J., Weth, T. Radial solutions and phase separation in a system of two coupled Schrödinger equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 190(1):83–106 (2008)

28. Willem, M. Minimax theorems. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1996

29. Zhang, Z.T., Perera, K. Sign changing solutions of Kirchhoff type problems via invariant sets of descent flow. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 317(2):456–463 (2006)